

Responses to Comments in Letter 163 from Elerine Shields, Lynden Resident

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond to the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Please see Letter 49, Response to Comment 9 for a discussion of toxic emissions associated with the proposed facility. A discussion of BACT (i.e., “most stringent control technology”) is provided in Letter 9, Response to Comment 5. The air quality impacts of the proposed project in Canada are discussed in Letter 3, Response to Comment 2.
2. Fogging and icing associated with cooling tower plumes were evaluated in the Draft EIS. The evaluation included dispersion modeling using five years of local meteorological information. The assessment concluded that plume-induced ground-level fog would be very infrequent, occurring for less than one hour per year, and that icing from the plume would not be expected.
3. The proposed facility would be required to comply with all applicable air quality regulations through its operating permit. Please see Letter 155, Response to Comment 7.
4. The Draft EIS discloses in several places that the project would require approximately 23 permanent workers. The statement that approximately 400 temporary construction workers would be required during the peak construction time, as stated on page 2-11 of the EIS, is correct.
5. Please see General Response J regarding flooding.
6. As discussed in Section 3.12 of the EIS, engineered safeguards would be in place during facility operation to minimize the potential for the release of hazardous materials to the environment. All hazardous materials stored onsite would meet applicable codes and regulations. An Emergency Response Plan would guide staff actions, including notifications, in the event of a spill.
7. Please see Letter 5, Response to Comment 9 and Letter 107, Response to Comment 22 for a discussion of noise impacts related to the proposed facility.
8. Please see General Response D for discussion of groundwater resources.
9. Please see General Response G for discussion of baseflow.
10. See Letter 142, Response to Comment 13 regarding MSDS sheets.
11. See Letter 3, Response to Comment 4 regarding EMF health effects.